Grand Valley State University

***General Education Committee Meeting***

3015 James H. Zumberge Hall

 Minutes of 10/13/2014

**PRESENT**: Kirk Anderson, Chair; Ella Fritzemeier; Emily Frigo; Melba Hoffer; Andrew Kalafut; Sarah King; Brian Kipp; Haiying Kong; Jose Lara; Paola Leon; Josita Maouene; Susan Strouse; Patrick Thorpe

**ALSO PRESENT:** C. “Griff” Griffin, Director, General Education; Jeanne Whitsel, General Education Office Coordinator

**NOT PRESENT:** Linda Pickett; Martina Reinhold; Paul Sicilian; David Vessey

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Member |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Approval of Agenda** |  | Approved per consensus |
| **Approval of 10/6/2014 minutes** |  | Approved per consensus |
| **Curriculum item: ART 260. We will decide how to proceed after hearing the chair’s report on his conversation with the proposer, along with recent** **Sail developments**. | When we received the requested amendment, it was not what we expected. SAIL had somehow changed one of the goals and the proposer used the “new” goal rather than the original one. We will ask her to go back to our original comments and address those. The original goals are in the old system; if needed, Kirk can direct her to that area and Griff can help her re-enter the correct goal information. |  |
| **CARs – two for the committee to review****CLA 250****COM 438** | There have been requests to post model CARs, but we don’t do that because: * We want the instructor’s own honest assessment of how things went, and
* They are written for the individual department rather than for “mass consumption”.

**CLA 250** In general, the GEC was happy with this CAR. Members were asked to email the chair if they have any notes to contribute to the reply letter.**COM 438** The GEC discussed this CAR, in particular the scores, which seemed low for a 400-level course.Members were again asked to email the chair with further thoughts or notes. |  |
| **Assessment: Student input**  | There are two forms of assessment:* Direct measures – the course assessments instructors do
* Indirect measures – student input in the form of an informal survey

 We are seeing a gap between student and teacher evaluations – teachers thought students learned the material better than the students thought they had. Students taking a course can be surveyed whether or not they are in the section being assessed. Grades are a good measure of content mastery, so the survey will be limited to skills goals. It was suggested that students be asked their perception of what level they achieved for the skills goals after taking a GE course. It was agreed that they should be given only one or two rows of a rubric so as to keep it short, and see what the return rate is. Open-ended questions should not be used on surveys, as those are considered the domain of faculty evaluations. Also, surveys should be given out a week before the Blackboard surveys are released.Members discussed how to word the stem to the skills goals rubric questions, how to motivate students to participate, and how to measure participation rates. The Student Senate representative will ask the Student Senate’s Educational Affairs Committee to come up with ways to motivate students to fill out the surveys.  |  |
| **Discussion of MTA** | The Michigan Transfer Agreement (MTA) has made some changes which have raised the bar on their requirements. In some areas their requirements are more stringent than GVSU’s, in others they are less so. * Students must earn a C in every course; GVSU’s GE Program only requires a D.
* A second science or math course was added, now matching our requirements.
* MTA now requires a second writing course, either English composition or oral communication. GVSU Admissions advises prospective students to take the composition course in order to obtain writing research skills. We do not have an oral communication option.
* We require an additional humanities course, and we may soon allow drawing/painting/sculpture/ceramics courses, which the MTA does not.
* We will ask the faculty in the Mathematical Sciences category how well each of their courses meet the MTA objectives.
 |  |
| **Chair’s Report** | Going forward, the chair will divide the committee into groups and assign each group CARs for evaluation. Members will not be assigned CARs from their own departments. The chair will distribute the CARs before the meetings so members can read and discuss them via email before each meeting. They will also be given time during the meeting to complete their discussion, fill in the feedback form and draft a response letter to be sent to the chair. The chair will then make minor edits to the draft or seek clarification, as needed, before sending to the instructor. |  |
| **Director’s Report** | Consisted of the MTA discussion above. |  |
| **Adjournment** |  | 4:21pm |